



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

p. ix, § 4, l. 16,	for 24, 6	read 24, 5
“ “ “ “	“ 29, 6	“ 29, 36
“ “ “ 19,	“ 11	“ 21
“ foot-note 2, line 1,	“	“ 20, 26
p. x, § 5, line 8,	“ 5	“ 12
“ “ “ 8,	“ 23	“ 24
“ “ “ 8,	“ 6	“ 7
“ “ “ 3 from bot.	“ 25	“ 15
“ foot-n. “ 5,	“ 28, 16	“ 28, 17
“ “ “ 5,	“ 31, 16	“ 31, 36
“ “ “ 7,	“ 17	“ 27
p. xi, text, “ 3 from top,	“ 17, 6	“ 17, 7
“ “ last line,	“ 5, 5	“ 4, 13
p. xii, “ line 1,	“ 10	“ 9
“ “ “ 15,	“ 21, 3	“ 21, 31
“ “ “ 8 from bot.	“ 29	“ 49
p. xiii, “ lines 4 and 8	“ quinque	“ sex
“ “ line 13,	“ 29	“ 28
“ “ “ 19,	“ 24	“ 25
p. xiv, “ “ 6,	“ Ez.	“ Ex.
“ “ “ 6,	“ 4	“ 14
p. xv, “ “ 4 from bot.	“ 25	“ 26
“ ft.-n. 1, “ 4	“ 22, 2	“ 22, 3
“ “ “ 4	“ 3, 15	“ 2, 12

O. O. FLETCHER.

Purpose without a Connective.—The simplest imaginable construction of two verbs, one of which is dependent upon the other, is that in which they are placed side by side without a connective. Such a construction is characteristic of infancy. It was doubtless very frequent in the early history of the Hebrew, as of other languages. It is still found, especially in poetry, where it is employed to give to a composition a vivacity not often sought in prose. The dependent verb is oftenest in the Imperfect, the tense suited to expressing the potentiality of an action (Driver, § 24). When this tense appears in its simplest form, there is sometimes difficulty in determining just what is the nature of the dependence expressed. In certain cases either of two or three interpretations may be adopted with little variation of the sense; *e. g.* Deut. XXXII., 39; Isa. L., 2; Prov. XIX., 25. In other cases the context favors a translation by one of the forms by which, in English, a purpose is expressed. When the Imperfect appears in a voluntative (jussive or cohortative) form, there is seldom any doubt with reference to its signification (Driver, § 46). It is then usually best translated by a dependent clause with a particle denoting a purpose.

I need only call attention to the fact that the voluntative is not always distinguishable, when used, and that the sacred writers are not consistent in the use of the moods. The Imperative is a few times employed after an Imperative without a connective.

The following are among the more striking examples under this head, arranged according to the use of the moods and tenses:

PERFECT—IMPERFECT.

Isa. xli., 2. The jussive **יִרְ** in this passage can hardly be equivalent to the simple Imperfect (Driver, § 64, Obs. Cf. the commentaries of Ewald and Delitzsch).—Job xxx., 28. The usual construction with the Infinitive is abandoned, probably because a repetition of the act is to be indicated.—Neh. xiii., 19. The command to the guard is the apodosis.

IMPERFECT CONSECUTIVE—IMPERFECT.

Isa. xli., 7. The confident assertion of the workmen, **לֹא יִכּוּט**, forms the apodosis.—Job xvi., 8. In this, as in the passage xxx., 28, just cited, the leading verb is **קִים**, after which the usual construction is that with the Infinitive.—2 Chron. iv., 6. The Infinitive is followed by an emphatic explanatory clause (Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, § 337 b).

IMPERFECT—IMPERFECT.

Ex. xxviii., 32; repeated, xxxix., 23, without the verb of the protasis.—Lev. xvi., 30; an emphatic explanatory clause.—Ps. li., 10: *that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice*.—Lv., 7: *that I may fly*; after a question implying a wish.—Lxxxviii., 11; really two successive questions (see Delitzsch *i. l.*).—Cii., 14; like the last example, instead of the more usual Infinitive.—Cxl., 9; similar to the construction with **פִּן**, but more striking.—Job xxiv., 14 (cf. xvi., 8).

IMPERATIVE—IMPERFECT.

Exod. vii., 9; with the jussive.—xviii., 19; a colloquial expression.—Ps. ix., 21: *that the nations may know*.—xxxiv., 12 (cf. Exod. xviii., 19).—xxxix., 5; with the cohortative.—li., 16.—Lxi., 8 (cf. Jonah ii., 1).—Lxxxvi., 11.—Cviii., 19: *that I may enter them, may praise Yah.*—Cxix., 17 (cf. verses 77 and 144).—Cxi., 145.

When the purpose is negative the apodosis regularly takes **אֵל**. Exod. x., 28. Ps. xix., 14 (cf. Job xxxiii., 18). Job xxxvi., 21.

INFINITIVE—IMPERFECT.

Hab. iii., 16: *to invade it*; another construction with the Infinitive.

PARTICIPLE—IMPERFECT.

Isa. v., 11 (cf. 1 Sam. xxix., 11, where a single act is denoted).—Xiii., 9; where the construction with the Infinitive is once used, but abandoned for that with the finite verb (cf. Lev. xvi., 30).

IMPERATIVE—IMPERATIVE.

Deut. i., 21. 1 Sam. xx., 36. Jer. xlviii., 6. There are several idiomatic expressions containing two Imperatives which might, perhaps, be shown originally to have implied a purpose; *e. g.* those in which the first Imperative is, **לֵךְ**, **קִים**, etc.

The foregoing examples may, in comparison with other expressions of purpose, be called indefinite. A particle may be supplied without changing the quality, but not without modifying the intensity of the idea. It is, therefore, plain that this construction cannot be said to denote a peculiar kind of purpose, but only to give to it a lively reality, whatever may be its peculiarity.

[In Syriac the omission of the connective is even more frequent than in

Hebrew (see Uhlemann, §§ 85. 4: α , β , and 62, 2). In this language the latter of two perfects without a connective may denote the purpose of the former (Uhlemann, § 60. 5, b ; Bernstein's *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, p. 56, ll. 3 and 12, and p. 78, l. 3).]

H. G. MITCHELL,

Boston.

On the Source of the Name יהוה.—Since the theory that the idea in the tetragrammaton as already used by Moses had undergone the change of a development, might find some support in the claim that the name *Yahweh* has been taken from other religious systems, it will be necessary briefly to explain the opinions of scholars, those of our day especially, on this subject, as also what seems to be the correct view concerning it. Since Israel could have borrowed the name in question only through the presupposed or real, direct or indirect, connection with other nations, it will be best to consider in order the different nations who are claimed to have made use of the name *Yahweh*.

That the Indo-Europeans have this Old Testament appellation for God in the word *Jovis*, is considered by v. Bohlen (*Gen.* p. ciii), Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 672), and J. G. Müller (*Die Semiten, etc.*, p. 163) as "a view not easily to be refuted." But so little direct connection between the Indo-European and the Semitic languages can be pointed out, that it is out of question to find a derivative of the Indo-European *div* (*to shine*) transferred into the Semitic; but rather must the name of *Yahweh*, used by one of the Semitic nations (Israel), be derived from a Semitic verb. Hitzig endeavored to prove for יהוה, not an etymological and linguistic, but rather an ideal and historico-religious connection with the Indo-European, by saying: "From all appearances, the word *Yahweh* has come from *Astuds*, i. e., *astuat* = the Existing-one, as in the Armenian language God is called. Moses modeled his name of God after this, but only because his mind was prepared to grasp the idea, and by reflection he was able to understand the truth and depth of the thought in *astuds*." But how is it possible, even if the story concerning the flood shows acquaintance with the Ararat of Armenia (*Gen.* viii., 4), and even if the oldest traditions of the Hebrews point rather to a direct north-easterly than a south-easterly source, to believe that Moses, while in Egypt, took an Armenian name of God as his model?

If then an Aryan or Japhetic origin of the tetragrammaton is apparently an impossibility, it seems, on the other hand, quite natural, on account of the actual connection between the Hebrews and the Hamitic (*Gen.* x., 8-12) original inhabitants of Babylon, to look for a proto-Chaldaic origin for the (commonly so considered) original form of *Yahweh*, namely *Yau*. This has been done last by Frederick Delitzsch (*Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 158 sq.). But I must on this point express my agreement with the criticism of Friedrich Philippi (*Ztschrift fuer Völkerpsychologie*, 1883, pp. 175-190). The latter has shown, on the one hand, that Delitzsch is unsuccessful in his attack on the generally accepted view, which takes יהוה to be a Qal form of הוה, and *Yahu*, *Yah*, *Yeho*, *Yo* to be abbreviations of this form, and, on the other hand, that there is no proof for Delitzsch's assertions, that an original *Yau* had been transformed into a *Yahu*; that there had been an Assyrio-Babylonian god named *Yau*; and that there had ever been a Sumerico-Akkadian name *i* for the divinity. According to Schrader (*Keilinschriften u. d. V. T.*, 1883, p. 25) a Hebrew or Assyrian origin of the name יהוה seems not even a possibility. But did not the Hamitic Canaanites, who had em-